Patrick Henry, and even the injudicious measure

taken by British statesmen between 1760 and

1774 would have hardly have led to revolution

Nowhere can the awakening consciousness of

divergence in the pre-Revolutionary era be recog-

nized more distinctly than in the conflict between

sembly.

The provincial Governor of the royal and proprietary colonies was appointed by the higher authority in England, although, in the one case the appointment came from the Crown, and, in the other, from a proprietor, or group of proprie tors. Ultimately, the Crown so far extended its control over the proprietary governments that even the appointment of governors by proprietors was subject to confirmation by the Crown. The royal governors were usually appointed on the recpendation of the Board of Trade, by order of the King in Council. In the earlier colonial period the governorships were commonly secured by the dependents or relations of influential courtiers or public men, but, later, they were often conferred on more rational grounds. As communication became more frequent between the colonies and the mother country, the former naturally acquired more influence over the selections made by the Crown. The practice of sending agents to repre sent colonial interests in London had a whole some effect upon the choice of governor. In one instance, indeed, the agent sent to represent the complaints of colonists against the Governor, was himself sent back with the Governor's commission. In the eighteenth century, it was not uncommon o place colonists in the Governor's chair. Of the ten royal governors of Massachusetts, four were Massachusetts men. After New Hampshire was organized as a separate colony, both her governors were chosen from among the residents of the province. The first governor appointed in New Jersey, after the "personal union" of that province with New York had been broken, was Lewis Morris, a colonist. In Virginla and other colonies, such appointments were sionally made.

The governorship, as the commission usually stated, was to be held during the King's pleasure, but to this general rule there were a few excep-tions in the first century of the colonial era. The commission given to Lord Delaware by the Virginia Company in 1610 was for life, and so was that issued to Thomas Culpepper in 1675. In 1683, the proprietors of East Jersey issued a commission to Robert Barclay as Governor for life, but, in later commissions of the New Jersey proprietors, the term of office was fixed at one year or until some other appointment should be made. As a matter of fact, Massachusetts during the eighty two years from 1692 to 1774 had but ten deaths. North Carolina, during the thirty-four years which clapsed between the supersesson of the proprietary by the royal government and the passage of the Stamp Act, had only three gover nors. New Hampshire after its separation from Massachusetts in 1741 had but two governors.

Ordinarily, a governor was assigned to a single

province, but to this rule also there were exceptions. The commission to Andres in 1688 in cluded not merely New England but New York and New Jersey. In 1697, the Earl of Bellomont became Governor of Massachusetts, New York and New Hampshire; the appointments to Massa chusetts and New Hampshire were combined un der several of his successors. In 1702, the govern ments of New York and New Jersey were united so far as the Executive was concerned. Pennsylvania and Delaware originally constituted bu one government; but the lower counties on the Delaware became restive under this arrangement, and, finally, secured from Penn permission to organize a separate Legislature. The two provinces, however, continued, as we have said to have a common Executive, and they had, like wise, a joint council. The combination of two govern ents under one person worked ill in practice, for the Governor was wont to reside most of the time in the larger province, and his absence from the smaller colony gave rise to complaints. It would sometimes happen, too, that adjacent provinces like New York and New Jersey or Massachusetts and New Hampshire had conflic ing in crests. The people of New Hampshire charged that Governor Belcher had shown great partiall y to Massa chuseits in the controversy between the two provinces in regard to boundaries. In 1680, an order in council was issued forbidding colonial governto absent themselves from four provinces. without leave, and, thereafter, it became coston forbidding him to come to Europe wi hour special was made for the temporary succession in the event of the governor's death or of his departure from the provinces. Ultimately a rule was adopted the royal governors that, if the governor died or left the colony, his place was to be taken by the licu enant-governor, or, in some cases, by a part of the juidelal system. It is clear that under commander in chief. In the absence of any lie tenant governor or commander to clitef, it was, at first, laid down that the council, as a whole, should assume the government, but, in 1707, Queen Anne issued a new general instruction to the effect that sereafter, the sentor councillor should execute the mmission in the governor's absence. Even in the royal governments, however, this order was not universally enforced until the reign of George When the government was assumed by the council or by the senior councillor, certain con stitutional limitations were imposed. For example, the instructions forbade such a provisional gov ernment to pass without a special order any act not immediately necessary, or to dissolve the assembly, or to remove any officers, without the consent of at least seven councillors. In exceptional circumstances, the lieutenant-governor remained in charge of the province for considerable periods. In Virginia, for instance, titular remore were, at different times, appointed, who held the it is and part of the emoluments s of the offices, while the actual conduct of affairs was in the hands of a resident lieutenant-governor. The salary ac ually received by this resident governor was, sometimes at least, the result of bargein between him and his nominal superfor

in office. Thus, in 1704, the Earl of Orkney was

made titular governor of Virginia, and held this office for more than thirty years. The lieutenant-governor, for the time being, would make special recements with the Earl for a division of the salary and the other profits of the office. Orkney was succeeded in this titular office by Lord Albemarle and by Lord Loudoun. In 1768, Lord Hotelourt was appointed governor, but, as he took up his residence in the province, the line of titular governors of Virginia came to an end

II. What were the emoluments of a royal governo in the colonies? A distinction must be made between his salary on the one hand and his feeand perquisites on the other. By the close of the French and Indian War, the salary had come to be dependent on temporary, and often annual grants of the provincial assembly. To this gen eral rule, however, there were four exceptions in Virginia and Maryland, the Assemblies had seen induced to make permanent grants to the Crown and the proprietor respectively for the support of the provincial government, and had lost their power to determine the governor's salary in North Carolina, both under the proprietors and under the Crown, the salary was paid out of the qui rent revenues of the province. In Georgia, the youngest of the colonies, the provincial estab-lishment was maintained by the Government in England. This is a summary statement of the rutcome of a long and bitter controversy over the question whether salary grants should be tem porary or permanent, a question of the utmos tance, involving the relations of the governo to the assembly on the one hand and to the hom rovernment on the other. The amount of the governor's salary varied, and it is hard to com ute the real value of sums that are often states in depreciated colonial currency. To the Gov ernor of Virginia was allowed \$2,000 sterling, ou of the duty of two shillings per hogshead levied on tobacca. In 1766, the Governor of New York received £2,000 sterling. In the other colonies the salaries as a rule were one thousand pounds o ess in sterling money, though they are ofter stated at much higher rates in the depre local currency. Between 1754 and 1756, Gov ernor Shirley of Massachusetts received £1,500 In 1748, he had refused £1900, or per annum. he ground that it was not equivalent to the one housand pounds sterling required by his instructions, and he finally succeeded in getting £2,400 in the colonial currency. In Georgia, the salary was at first \$600, and later, \$1,000, and it had as we have said, the advantage of not being de sendent on the favor of the assembly and of being payable in sterling money.

the provincial Governor and the provincial As In addition to his salary, the governor had rarious other sources of income. Perhaps the most important of these were the fees, which, at first, seem to have been fixed not by law but by English custom;" ultimately, in many cases, they were regulated by acts of the provincial ssembly. In the act passed by the New Jersey Assembly in 1748, the amounts of the governor's ees varied from three shillings for a writ of error to the twenty shillings collected for every attorney's license to practice; the marriage license for was ten shillings. The Maryland Naturalization act of 1592 allowed the governor a fee of £3 for drawing a patent of naturalization. In Virginia, there were fees of forty shillings for a patent of naturalization, of twenty shillings for a mar riage license and of thirty-five shillings for a li censed "ordinary." Among other perquisites of a governor was a share of the fines and forcitures; usually a third, and, sometimes, a half, Thus a third of the scizures and forfeitures of vessels for violations of the Navigation act went to the governor. By a Delaware law passed in the reign of King George II, the property of persons dying interstate became the governor's A governor also often received presents or grants rom the assembly for special services. In 1696, a piece of land in Annapolis was given to the Governor of Maryland at his request; a few years earlier, the governor had received from the assembly twenty thousand pounds of tobacco. In 1742, the New Hampshire Assembly voted the governor a present of \$500. To Governor Shirley of Massachusetts were granted £250 for the sevices rendered by him in connection with the Indians on the Kennebec. On Governor Pow nall's departure for England in 1760, the General Court made him a present of £200. The total amount of a governor's income cannot be exactly stated in any given case. The Governor of Vir ginia seems to have had the largest revenue, at least when he was not obliged to share the spoils with some titular governor who remained the mother country. Lieutenant-Governor Dinwiddle was able to allow his absentee superior. Lord Albemarle, the sum of £1,665 annually. probable that the income of the office at that time ranged from twenty five hundred to three thous and pounds in sterling money. Burnaby in his "Travels," gives the Governor of Massachusetts an annual income, including perquisites of about thirteen hundred pounds sterling. Governor Sharpe of Maryland concluded not to exchange his office for the Governorship of New York because he was informed that the latter post was governors, in other words, the average term was | not worth more than £1,600. The governorship a little more than eight years, and two of the gov. of New Jersey seems to have been one of the least fitable neverthel from £800 to £1,000. On the whole, the provincial overnors seem to have been liberally paid if their incomes be compared with those of our pre-

111. The provincial governor not only had some in irect power over legislation through his influence over the assembly, but he was himself a part of the egislative system. Some of the early Governors had been invested with legislative authority, either ndependently or with the co-operation of the councit, but this abnormal state of things gradually passed away, leaving to the Governor only a limited right of making ordinances, and the power to approve or veto the acts of the Assembly. The Governor was also a part of the judicial system. In nost of the colonies, indeed, his criminal jurisdiction was, in course of time, extinguished, but ir irginia the Governor and Council, under the name of the General Court, continued to be the highest tribunal in all cases criminal as well as civil. The most important judicial junction of the Governor and council was the hearing of appeals in civil cases where the value in question exceeded a fixed sum. The Governor, was furthermore, the keeper of the great seal of the province, and as such was, in theory, the Chancellor having urisdiction in equity cases. In some provinces, the evernor himself constituted the Chancery Court. others, the Governor and council were the equity utges, each with an equal vote. As a part of his eo lesiastical jurisdiction, the Governor had the probate of wills and the issuance of marriage licenses either alone or with the council, he usually acted as a court of probate; in Massachusetta and New Hampshire the Governor and council constituted a court for the decision of questions of marriage and divorce. The Governor was also named in the ary to inservin a governor's instructions a clause royal commission for the trial of piracy cases. This ission usually included the governors of a permission from the Crown. Careful provision for adjacent colonies, with some other officers of the colonial service. Thus the Governor, besides having an indirect influence upon the administration of justice through his control of the organization of the courts and the machinery of enforce ment, was himself, as we have said, an important

> such aregime the independence of the judiciary must have been seriously impaired. We observe, finally, that a Governor's commission authorized him, either directly or through officers of his appointment, to arm, muster and ommand all persons residing within his province transfer them from place to place; to resist all enemics, pirates or rebels; to transport troops to other provinces in order to defend them against invasion, and, in short, to do anything properly selonging to the office of commander in chief. These powers were to be exercised by the Governo independently. Furthermore, he might, with the advice and consent of the council, establish fortifications and furnish them with supplies, and in time of actual war he might execute martial law In practice, however, the scope of the military owers of the Governor was far from being as large as the terms of his commission would indicate. They could not be exercised without financial support from the Assembly, a support which was often rudgingly given and sometimes refused. The truth is that the Assembly, through its mere exist ence as a critical body, was the organized expres sion of the public opinion of the province, and through its power over the purse was able to control the Governor's action to an extent which more than counteracted the measure of authority with

which he was nominally invested over the Legislature. In this control of the provincial f the Assembly had a formidable weapon, which i used not only as an instrument of real to abuses of the executive power, but also as a means of extorting from the Governor im portant functions properly pertaining to the execuvery large part of the executive power eventually fell into the hands of the Assembly or of appointees.

## Gardiner's History of England.

In a volume of one thousand pages, Mr. samuel R. Gardiner, the well-known historian of he first two Stuarts, of the Commonwealth and the otectorate, has prepared a Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to 1885 (Long mana.) This book is intended for such readers as have already an elementary knowledge of the main facts of English history, and aims at meeting their needs by the avoidance of such a multiplicity of details as would be apt to overburden the emory. An admirable feature of the work is the ollection of genealogical tables which enable one to comprehend at a glance the titles of the several dynastics and of the various claimants of the Crown. The last eleven years, those, namely, between 1874 and 1885, are treated in a manner which excludes all expression of the author's per-sonal views, either on the character of the actors or the value of the work performed by them. thing of the same reticence is observed in the pages dealing with the years immediately preceding 1874. It is certain that we have not yet the naterial for the formation of a final judgment on many points arising in this part of Mr. Gardiner's narrative, and it was therefore, better to abstain from the utterance of provisional conclusions. It will be remarked that the name of Roger Bacon is omitted, and that there are only brief allusions to such writers as Dickens and Thackery. This is because the writer's object in the limited space at his command has been to exhibit only that side of literature which has been connected with the general, political and intellectual movement of the country, and to leave unnoticed the purely literary or scientific qualities of particular writers. There are no maps in the book before us, but the reader is referred to a companion volume, the School Atlas of English History," which has ecently been brought out by the same publishers.

I. That part of the volume which deals with the dition of Britain before the Roman invasion will be found peculiarly interesting. Here Mr. Cardiner has availed himself of the latest concluions reached by geologists, palaeontologists, ethnologists and archeologists. He begins by pointing out that in the periodof geological time known as the Picistiocene age, the part of the earth's surface afterwards called Britain was attached to the Continent, so that animals could pass over on dry land. The climate was much colder than it is now, and it is known from the bones which have been uncarthed that the country was then inhabited by wolves, bears, mammoths, wooly rhinoceroses, and other creatures now extinct. No human remains have been found among these bones, but there is no doubt that men existed contemporaneously with the animals of which these bones are the relies, because, in the river drift, or gravel washed down by rivers, there have been vered flints sharpened by chipping, which can only have been produced by the hand of man. The men who used them are known as Palæolithic or the men of ancient stone, because these stone implements are rougher, and, therefore, older than others which have been laid bare. These palesolithic men of the river drift were a race of stunte savares who did not cultivate the ground, but lived on the animals which they killed, and must have had great difficulty in procuring food, as they did not know how to make handles for their sharpened flints, and must, therefore, have had to hold them in their hands. This race was succeeded by other men that dwelt in caves. These as well as their predecessors are known as Palgoli thics, inasmuch as their weapons were still very rude. Since, however, they had learned to make handles for them, they could construct arrows, harpoons and javelina. They also made awis and needles of stone; and, what is more remarkable possessed a decided artistic power which enabled them by a few vigorous scratches to indicate the forms of horses, mammoths, reindeer and other animals. Traces of palmolithic men of this type have been found as far north as Derbyshire. Their escendants, however, are no longer to be met with in the British Islands. The Eskimos of the extreme north-east of America have the same artistic faculty and the same disregard for the dead, and it has, therefore, been inferred that the cavedwellers of Britain were of the race to which the modern Eskimos belong. Ages passed away during which the climate

became more temperate and the earth's surface in northwestern Europe sank to a lower level. The seas afterwards known as the North Sea and the English Channel flowed over the depres sion, and an island was thus formed out of land which had once been part of the Continent. After this process had taken place, a third race appear ed, which must have crossed the sea in rafts or canoes, and which took the place of the Paleolithic men. They are known as Neolithic, or the men of the new stone ago, because their stone implements were of a new kind, being polished and more efficient than those of their predeces sora. They thus had the advantage of superior weapons, and, perhaps, of superior strength; at all events, they were able to overpower those whom they found in Britain. With their stone axes, they made clearings in the woods in which to place their settlements. They brought with them domestic animals, sheep and goats, dogs and pigs. They spun thread with spindle and distaff, and wove it into cloth upon a loom. They grew grain and manufactured a rude kind of pottery. Each tribe lived in a state of war with its neighbors; when attacked in force it took shelter on the hills in places of refuge which were surrounded by lofty mounds and ditches. Many of these coigns of vantage are still to be seen, as, for instance, the one which bears the name of Maiden Castle near Dorchester. On the open hills, ton are still to be found the long barrows which th Neolithic men raised over the dead. Mr. Gardines has but little doubt that these men. whose way life was so superior to that of their Eskimo-like predecessors, were of the race now known as therian which at one time, inhabited a great part of western Europe, but which has since mingled with other races. The Basques of the Pyrennees are the only Iberians who still preserve anything like purity of descent, though even the

Basques have in them blood the origin of which is The Iberians, in their turn, were followed to ritain by a swarm of newcomers called Celta The Celts belonged to a group of peoples somemes known as the Aryan group, to which also belonged Teutons, Slava, Italiana, Greeks and certain ancient races of Persta and India. Of the so called Aryan peoples, the Celts seem to have been the first to arrive in the West, where they seized upon lands in Spain, in Gaul and in Britain, which, before them, the Iberians had occupied. They did not, however, destroy the Iberians altogether. The conquerors undoubtedly preserved some of the men of the conquered race as slaves. and a still larger number of young and comely women who became the mothers of their children in time the slaves and the children learned to speak the language of their masters or fathers The Celts, it should be noted, were fair-haired and taller than the Iberians whom they conquered, and, to a large extent, displaced. They had the advantage of possessing weapons of bronze, for which even the polished stone weapons of the Iberians were no match. They burned their dead, instead of burying them, and raised over the ashes the round barrows which are still to be found in termingled with the long barrows of the Iberiana. The carliest known name given to the islan new called Great Britain was Albion. It is uncer tain whether the word is of Caltie or of Ibe gin. The later name, Britain, is derived from and swarm of Celts called Brythons, or Britons, who, after a long interval, followed the first Celtic immigration. The descendants of the first immigrants are distinguished from the newcomets by the name of Goldela, and it is probable that the Goldels were at one time sattled in Britain as well as in Ireland, and that they were pushed across the sea into Ireland by the stronger and more civilized Britons. At all events, when history begins, Goldeln are only to be found in Ireland,

what is now known as Scotland, and sent some fishoots into Wales. At present, the languages derived from the tongue spoken by the Goidels are he Gaelic of the Highlands, the Manx of the late of Man, and the Erse of Ireland. The only language now spoken in the British Isles which is derived from that of the Britons is the Weish; but the old Cornish language, which was spoken up to nearly the close of the eighteenth century, came from the same stock. It is, therefore, pronounced likely that the Britons pushed the Goldels northwards and westwards, as the Goidels had formerly pushed the Iberians in the same directions. Mr. Gardiner deems it probable that the Britons erected the huge stone circle of Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain, although he does not think it possible t affirm this with certainty. The stone circle at Avebury is of an earlier date and undetermin origin. Both circles were intended originally to serve as monuments of the dead, although it has been sometimes supposed that they were also used as temples.

It was long presumed that the Phonicians came to Britain from the coast of Syria, or from their colonies at Carthage and in the south of Spain. for the tin which they needed in the manufacture of bronze. The peninsula of Devon and Cornwall is the only part of the island which producer tin, and it has, therefore, been inferred that the Cassiterides, or Tin Islands, which the Phoenicians visited, were to be found in that region. Mr. Gardiner, however, accepts the conclusions of those investigators who have recently maintained that the Cassiterides were probably off th coast of Galicia in Spain, and, he, consequently discards the belief that the Phymicians Britain for tin as very questionable. In his opin ion, the first educated visitor who reached Britain was Pytheas, the Greek, who was sent by the merchants of the Greek colony of Massilia (Mars eilles) about 330 B. C., to make discoveries which might lead to the opening across Gaul of a trade route between Britain and their city. It was probably, Mr. Gardiner thinks, in consequence of information which Pytheas carried to Massilie on his return, that a trade sprang up in British tin. Another Greek, Posidonius, who came to Britain two centuries after Pytheas, found the trade in full working order. The tin was brought by land from the present Devon or Cornwall an island called Ictis, which was only accessible on foot after the tide had ebbed. This island was probably Thanet, afterwards memorable as the first permanent settlement of the Teutons. Thanet in those days was cut off from the main land by an arm of the sea which could be crossed on foot at low water. From Thanet the tin was carried into Gaul across the Straits, and was then conveyed in wagons to the Rhone, to be floated

down to the Mediterranean. There seem to have been no fewer than three Celtic immigrations into Britain before Cosar's invasion. During the time when the trade in tin just mentioned was being carried on, tribes of Gauls and Belgians landed in Britain. The Gauls were certainly, and the Belgians were probably, of the same Celtic race as that which already occupied the island. The Gauls settled on the east coast as far as the Fens and the Wash whilst the Belgians occupied the south coast, and pushed northwards toward the Somersc Avor Nothing is known of the relations be tween the newcomers and the older Ceitic inhabitants. Mr. Gardiner offers the surmise that those who arrived last contented themselves with may tering those whom they defeated, without attempt ing to exterminate them. At all events, states to some extent were formed by the conquerors. Thus the Cantil occupied the open ground to the orth of the great forest which then filled the valley between the chalk ranges of the North and South Downs, the Trinobantes dwelt between the Lea and the Essex Stour; the Iceni occupied the peninsula between the Fens and the sea, which was afterward known as East Anglis (Norfolk and Suffolk); and the Catuvellauni dwelt to the west of the Trinohantes, spreading over the modern Hertfordshire and the neighboring districts. There were other states in Britain, bu the tribes which have been named had the advant age of being situated in the southeastern part of the island, and, therefore, of being in commercial communication with the continental Gauls of their own race and language. The increase of trade with the continent brought with it the intro duction of some things which the Britons descend ed from the two first immigrations would not have invented for themselves. For instance, the inhabitants of the southeast of Britain began to use gold coins and decorations in imitation of those which were then common in Gaul. In spite of these improvements, however, even the most civi lized Gauls and Belgians in the southeastern parts of the island were still in rude and barbarous condition. They had no towns, but dwelt in scattered buts. When hey were hard pressed by an enemy, the look refuge in an open space cleared in the woods and surrounded by a high earthwork, crowned by a palisade and guarded by felled trees. When they went out to battle, they dyed their faces in order to terrify their enemies. Their warriors front of the enemy's line, till they espied an openng in his ranks. They then leaped down and charged on foot into the gap. Their charloteers in the meanwhile drove off the horses to a safe distance, so as to be ready to take up hair comrades if the battle went against them. As regards the religion of the Britons, it is on ain that the Celtic races worshipped many gods. In Gaul, the Druids, who were the ministers of religion, taught the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and gave moral instruction to the young. In Ireland, and perhaps in Britain, they were conjurers and wizards. Both in Gaul and Britain, they kept up the traditional belief which had once been prevalent in all parts of the world that the gods could only be appeared by sacrifloor. It was supposed that they needed to drink human blood or to be supplied with human slaves, and that the only way to give them what the wanted was to despatch as many human beings as possible into the other world. The favorite vay of doing this was to construct a large wicker basket in the shape of a man, to cram it with mer and women and to set it on fire.

The two invasions of Britain by Julius Cosar ook place in B. C. 55 and 54. No consecutive attempt, however, was made by the Romans to conquer Britain until nearly a century later, namely in A. D. 48. The conquest of the island south of the Firth of Forth may be regarded as having been completed by Agricola in A. D. 84 In A. D. 409, the last Roman legion left Britain, and, thenceforth, the defense of the island against the Picts and Scots on the north and west, and against the Teutons Gutes, Saxons and Angles. on the south and cast, was relegated to the Christian ized Britons. What had the Romans accomplished in the island during upwards of three centuries Mr. Gardiner is, of course, familiar with the latest attempts to answer this question, but he acknowledges that very little is known of the history of the Roman province of Britain, except that it made considerable progress in civilization. The Romans were great road makers, and, although their first object was to enable their soldiers to march easily from one part of the country to another, they thereby encouraged commercial inter ourse. Forests were to some extent cleared away by the sides of the new roads, and fresh ground was thrown open to tilling. Mines were worked and country houses built, the remains of some of which are still to be seen, and they bear testimony to the increased well-being of a population which excepting in the southeastern part of the island, had, at the arrival of the Romans, been little removed from savagery. It is certain that cities sprang up in great numbers during the Roman period. Some of them were at first garrisoned lowns like Eboracum, Deva and Isca Silurum Others, like Verulamium near the present St St. Albana, occupied the sites of the old stockade mee used as places of refuge by the Celts, or, like Lindum on the top of the hill on which Lincoln Cathedral now stands, were placed in strongly defensible positions. Aque Sults, the modern Bath, owes its existence to its warm medicinal springs. The chief port of commerce was Londinium, the modern London. As the attempts to explain its name by the Celtic language have falled, it is pronounced possible that an inhabited post existed there even before the Celts arrived The Roman town was situated an the hill on which St. Paul'anow stands. The valley of the Thames,

then filled with a wide marsh, or broad expanse crossed the river by a ford at Lambeth, but, as Londinium grew in importance, a ferry was established where London Bridge now stands, and the Romans, in course of time, superseded the ferry by a bridge. It is no wonder that the Roman roads, both from the north and from the south, con verged upon London. Just as Eboracum or York was a fitting centre for military operations directed o the defense of the northern frontier, London was the fitting centre of a commerce carried on with the Continent, and the place would, naturally, increase in importance in proportion to the exten sion of that traffic. Owing to the improvement of communications and the growth of trade and industry under the Romans, the tribal wars died away, and even the old tribal names were almost forgotten. Men who lived in the valley of the Severn came to look upon themselves as belong ing to the same people as men who lived in the valleys of the Trent and the Thames. The active and enterprising young men were attracted to the cities, at first by the novelty of the luxurious nabits in which they learned to indulge, but, afterwards, because they were allowed to take part in he management of local business. In each district, a council was formed of the richer and more conspicuous inhabitants, and this council had o provide for the building of temples, the holding f festivals, the erection of fortifications and the laying of streets. Justice was done between man and man according to the Roman law, which was the best law which the world had see time came when no Briton south of the Firth of Forth wished to oppose the Roman government or to bring back the old times of barbarism. Great however, as was the progress made by Britai under the Romans, there was something still wanting. The Briton had ceased to be called pon to die for his tribe, and he was not expected to die for Britain. The island had become a mor omfortable country to live in, but it was not the ousiness of its own inhabitants to guard it. Briton ooked upon their own defense as something to be lone for them by the Emperor, not as som o be done by themselves. Thus, while they ived on friendly terms with one another, the had nothing of what we now call patriotism Hence, after the departure of the Romans, a cor iderable period clapsed before the Britons ac quired the power of protecting themselves agains

IV.

the incursions of the Picts and Scots, and of the

natives of the coast of Germany and Juliand.

Who were these invading peoples about which such vague and misleading notions used to be current in the school histories? The Picts in habited that part of Scotland which lay north of the wall connecting the Forth and the Clyde They were the same people that had been called Caledonians in the time of Agricola, that is to say, in the latter half of the first century of our era. Why they had ceased to be called Caledonian is unknown. The ordinary derivation of their names from the Latin pictus, an adjective said to have been applied to them because they painted their bodies, is inaccurate. The opinions of ethno ogists differ as to whether they were Goidels with strong Iberian strain, or Iberians with a Goldeli admixture. Mr. Gardiner is one of those who are inclined to consider them Iberians; at all event the Picts were more savage than the Britons had been before they were influenced by Roman civil ration. The Scots, who afterwards settled in what is now known as Scotland, dwelt in Ireland is the time of the departure of the legions from Britain. Whilst the Picts, therefore, assailed the toman province by land, and strove to break through the walls which defended its norther contier, the Scots crossed the Irish Sea in light boats to plunder and slay. The Saxons, who and been no less deadly enemies of the Roman government, were as flerce and restless as the licts and Scots, and were better equipped and armed. At first they were only known to the inhabitants of Britain as merciless pirates. In their long, flat-bottomed vessels, they swooped down on some undefended part of the coast, and arried off not only the property of rich Romans, but even men and women to be sold in the slave market. The Saxons were men of Teu ionic race, speaking one of the languages after wards known as Low German which were once spoken in the whole of north Germany. The se called Saxon pirates were probably drawn from the whole of the scacoast stretching from the tip of the Peninsula of Jutland to the mouth of the Ems; if so, there were amongst them Jutes, whose somes were in Jutland itself; Angles, who inhabited Schleswig and Holstein; and Saxon properly so termed, who dwelt about the mouth of the Elbe and further to the west. All these people afterwards took part in the conquest of southern Britain, and it is not unlikely that they shared in the original piratical attacks. Whether this was the case or not, the pirates came from creeks and inlets outside the Roman Empire, whose boundary was the Rhine, and they could only be successfully repressed by a power possessed of a good fleet, able to seek out the aggressors in their own homes, and to stop the mes always been weak at sea, and they were weaker in the fourth century of our era than they had been in earlier days. They were therefore obliged to content themselves the defensive. In the fourth century, that division of the island which the Romans called Lower Britain, apparently the southeastern part, was especially exposed to the attacks of the Saxon pirates. Fortresses were crected beween the Wash and Beachy Head at every point where an inlet of the sea afforded an opening to an invader. The whole of this part of the coast of Britain became known as the "Saxon Shore because it was subjected to attacks from the Saxons and a special officer, known as the Count of the Saxon Shore, was appointed to take charge It is well-known that the three Continenta peoples who in time effected the conquest of

of a line rough ly corresponding with the present eastern boundary of Wales, were ultimately designated amongst themselves by the common name of English, a name which was originally equivalent to Angle. On the other hand, amongst the whole of the surviving Celtic population, the newcomers were only known as Saxons. The mode in which the English treated the Britons was very different from that practised by the Romana, who were a civilized people and aimed at governing a conquered race. The invaders from the other side of the North Sea drove out the Britons in order to find homes for themselves, and they preferred to settle in the country rather than in the towns. No Englishman had ever lived in a town in his German home, or was able to appreciate the advantages of the commerce and manufactures by which towns, are supported. Neither were they inclined to allow the inhabitants of the Roman towns to remain unmolested in the midst of them. When the great fortified town of Anderida on the Saxon shore was captured, not a Briton escaped alive, and there is good reason to believe that many of the other towns fared no better, especially as the remains of some of them still show marks of the fire by which they were consumed. What took place in the open country cannot certainly be known. Many of the British were unquestionsbly killed. Many took refuge in tens or woods, or fled to those portions of the island in which their ountrymen were still independent. Mr. Gardiner is one of those who flud it difficult to decide to what extent the men who remained behind were spared, but he deems it impossible to doubt that a consider able number of women were spared from slaughter. The conquerors, at their landing, must have been for the most part young men, and when they wanted wives it would be far easier for them to seize the daughters of slain Britons than to fetch women from the bank of the Elbe. Whether the bondmen of whom we hear not long after the conquest were Englishmen or Britons, is still disputed. The evidence bearing on the subject is exceedingly scanty. It is at least certain, however, that the further the conquest progressed westward, the greater was the number of Britons preserved alive. On the eastern and southern coasts, the bulk of the population was undoubtedly English There English institutions and the English language took firm root. The conquerors looked on the Britons with the utmost contempt, naming them Welsh, a name which no Briton thought of giving to himself but which the Germans had been in the habit of applying somewhat disdainfully to the Ceits on the continent. So far as British words though, is later times, they colonized a part of for some distance above and below the bill, was have entered into the English language at all, sented in 1678 by Maria Therms., many

hey have been words such as gown or curd, which are likely to have been used by women, o words such as cart or pony, which are likely to have been used by agricultural laborers. The testimony of language, therefore, may be adduced in favor of the view that many women and many agricultural laborers were spared by the conquer ors. It is a significant fact that after the defeat of the West Saxons by the Britons at Faddiley in A. D. 584, the former split up into two peoples. Those of them who had settled in the lower Severn valley took the name of Hwiccan, and joined the Britons against their own kindred. This alliance could hardly have taken place if the Hwiccans, in settling in the Severn valley had destroyed the whole or even a considerable part of the Celtic population. The comparatively slow advance of the Angles in the region north of the Humber is attributed by Mr. Gardiner to the existence of strong Celtic state in their front. Welsh tradition speaks of a ruler named Cunedda who, after the eparture of the Roman legions, governed the tract extending from the Clyde to the south of Wales, which formed the greater part of the division once known as Upper Britain. This territory was in habited by a mixed body of Britons and Goldels, with an isolated body of Picts in Galloway. The ommon danger from the English fused them to gether, and as a sign of the effacement of old disinctions, they took the name of Kymry, or Com rades, the name by which the Welsh are known amongst one another to this day, and which is als preserved in the name of Cumberland, though the Celuc language is no longer spoken there.

at which Mr. Gardiner has arrived. After recalling the fact that Harold, as soon as he reached the point of danger, drew up his army on the long hill of Senlac, on which Battle Abbey now stands. our author points out wherein the military equipment of the Normans was superior to that of the English. "The English fought on foot mostly with two-handed axes; the Normans fought not only on horseback with lances, but also with infantry, some of them being archers. A horse, the principal weapon of a horseman, has more momentum than an armed footman, whilst an arrow can reach the object at which it is aimed long before a horse, and Harold was, therefore, obliged to attempt to lessen the danger by defen-sive contrivances." Mr. Gardiner goes on to say that the English King, had in his favor the slope of the hill up which the Normans would have to ride, and he raised near the top of it a wooden "palisade" to keep off the enemy's caralry from sweeping away his footmen. Strong as his defence was, it was immovable, and, therefore made it impossible for Harold to change his arrangement, as the fortunes of the day might William on the other hand, had not only a better armed force, but a more flexible on He could move his men from place to place, and make use of each opportunity as it arrived. The English were brave enough, but William was a more intelligent leader than Harold, and his men were under much better control. Twice after the battle had begun, the Norman horsemen charged up the hill, only to be driven back. Then "William finding that the dyke was not to be storm ed by a direct attack, met the difficulty by galling the English with a shower of arrows, and order ing his left wing to turn and fly. The stratagen was successful. Some of the English rushed down the hill in pursuit. The fugitives faced round and charged the pursuers, following them over the dyke. The English on the hill were thus left unguarded; but they held out stoutly, and, as the Norman horsemen, now in occupa-

tion of one end of the hill, charged flercely along

its crost, they locked their shields firmly to-

for victory." It appears, then, according to Mr.

jardiner, that Harold's soluters were, at first,

the son of Edmund Mortimer, by Philippa, the

the Duke of Lancaster. The title of the Yorkist

daughter of the Duke of Clarence, elder brother of

defended on all sides by a palisade or dyke, but that, after the Normans gained access to their flank or rear, they opposed to the enemy at this point a shield wail. Almost as much stress is laid by Mr. Gardiner as by Prof. Freeman on the non-recognition in England up to a comparatively late period of the title to rule by the right of primogeniture. Will liam I., of course, reigned by conquest, but both William II. and Henry I. were younger sons of the conqueror, and, according to the law of primogeniture, the Crown belonged to their elder brother Robert, and, afterwards, to Robert's son, William Clita. Stephen, of course, being the son of the Conueror's daughter, Adela, had an inferior claim to that of Matilda, the daughter of Henry L, and, con sequently, to that of her son, who became Henry II. So, too, the claim of John the youngest son of Henry II., to succeed Richard I., was inferior to that of Arthur, the son of John's elder brother he be a statesman as well. Geoffrey. In all these cases, however, the successful candidate was the choice of the English barons, whose assembly took the place of the Witenagemot of pre-Norman times. It is equally certain that, according to the law of primogen Balliols after the death at sea of the "Maid of In the first year after his return, he tried to get Norway," had a better right to the Scottish crown than had the Bruces, because the former, like the Comyns, were descended from an elder daughter of David, Earl of Huntingdon. That the Kings of the House of Lancaster had only a Parliamen tary title is well known, the true heir to the English throne after the death of Richard II. being

claimants of the crown was derived, of course, not from the Duke of York, youngest son of Edward III, but through the Morlimers, from the Duke of Clarence, that king's second son. Between the usurper Richard III. Crown stood not only the two sons of Edward IV., namely, Edward V. and the Duke of York, and their sister, the Princess Elizabeth but, also, the Earl of Warwick, son of the Duke of Britain south of the Firth of Forth and east Clarence, and the latter's daughter, Margaret, who, by her marriage to Sir Richard Pole, became the mother of Henry, Lord Montague, and Sir Reginald Pole, ultimately Cardinal Bishop of Canterbury. Not only the Earl of Warwick, and all the descendants of the Duke of Clarance but all the descendants of John de la Pole by Elizabeth, the daughter of Richard, Duke of York, had a better claim than Henry VIL, whose title was a parliamentary one, except so far as it was strengthened by marriage with Elizabeth of York. daughter of Edward IV. We may also note the fact that while the title of James I. to succeed Eliz aboth rested on his descent from Margaret, the elder sister of Henry VIII, an act of Parliament passed in 1544 had authorized Henry VIII to provide by will for the future occupancy of the throne, in case of the failure of his own descendants. In accordance with this act, he did by will leave th grown in case of such failure, to the descendants of his younger sister Mary, leaving out those of his elder sister Margaret. It will be remembered that Henry's sister Mary by her second marriage to the Duke of Suffolk, had one daughter, Frances who, by her marriage to Henry Grey, Marquesa Dorset and subsequently Duke of Suffolk, had three daughters, namely, Jane Grey, Catherine Grey and Mary Grey. Edward VL by will left the Crown to Lady Jane Grey instead of to either of his sisters, Mary and Elizabeth. Catherine Grey was thrown into prison by Elizabeth committing the offence of marryfor ing without the Queen's leave. According to the law passed in 1544, and never repealed, the heir to the Crown on the death of Elizabeth was William Seymour, who, being the son of Lady Catherine Grey, by the Earl of Hertford, inherited the claims of the Suffolk line There were, however, some doubts current about his legitimacy, as, though his parents had been married in due form, the ceremony had taken place in private, and it was believed by many that it had never taken place at all. It was the son of this William Seymour who in the reign of James L married Arabella Stuart, who was claimant to the English crewn by desecut through a brother of Lord Darnley from Margaret, elder sister of Henry VIII. The title of William III. and Mary, of Anne and of the English sovereigns belonging to the House of Hanover is, of course purely Parliamentary. So far as the law of primogeniture goes, the right to the English Crown is vested not in Queen Victoria, who descends from Elizabeth, the Electrons Palatine, daughter of James I, but in the descendants of He

Prochess of Orleans, daughier of Charles L. repr

Drietta

Prince Louis Leopold of Bavaria and the most many children. VI. With the seventeenth century, Mr. Gardiner eners the field which he has made peculiar his own. With regard to the trial and execution of Charles I we read on page 557: "On Jan. 1, 1649, the purged House of Commons proposed to appoint a High Court of Justice to try Charles, but the Lords

refused to take part in the act. On the 4th, the Commons declared that the people under God were the source of all just powers, and the House of Commons, being chosen by the people, formed the supreme power in England, having no need of either King or House of Lords." Our author expresses the opinion that never was constitutional pedantry carried further than when this declaration was issued by a mere fragment of a House elected in 1640, which, even if all its members had been present, could only claim to have represented the people some years before. He adds that "Charles's accusers had, on their side, the discredit which always comes to those who, using force, try to give it the appearance of le gality." Charles now had all the credit of standing up for the law which, in his earlier life, he had wrenched to establish absolutism. He refused o plead before the High Court on the ground that is had no jurisdiction over a King. "His assailante fell back on the merest technicality. Instead of charging him with the intrigues to bring foreign armies into England, of which he had been really guilty, they accused him of high treason against he nation because, forsooth, he had appeared in arms against his subjects in the first civil war That were the results of Charles's execution? In view of the heated controversy relating to Mr. Gardiner answers that after the King had he Battle of Hastings or Senlac, which was car been beheaded, all that could be perman ried on between Prof. Freeman on the one hand accomplished by his opponents had been effected and several other students of the subject on the When the Long Parliament met in Nov. 1640, other, the reader may like to see the conclusion all Englishmen had combined to bring Charles to submit to parliamentary control. After the summer of 1641, a considerable part of the nation, oming to the conclusion that Charles was ready to use force rather than to submit, took arms against him to compel him to give way. Toward the end of 1647, a minority of Englishmen, including the army, came to the conclusion that it was necessary to deprive Charles of all real power the country was not to be exposed to constantly recurring danger whenever he saw fit to assert claims to the authority which he had lost In 1648, a yet smaller minority came to the co dusion that security could only be obtained if he were deprived of life. In depriving the King of life, all had been done which force could do The army could guard a scaffold, but it could not econstruct society. The vast majority of that part of the nation which cared about politics at all, disliked being ruled by Charles, and disliked being ruled by an army even more than had formerly disliked being ruled by Charles, and refused its support to the new institutions which, under the patronage of the army, were being erected in the name of the people

It is recognized by Mr. Gardiner that, during the dispute between the Presbyterians and the army in the spring of 1647, Cromwell's position was a delicate one. He sympathized not only with the demands of the soldiers for full pay, but also with the demand of the religious enth for toleration. Yet he had a strong sense of the evils certain to ensue from allowing overshrow the civil institutions of the country, and, both as a member of the House of Commons and as an officer, he did his best to avert so dire catastrophe. Attention is directed by the author to the fact which, striking as it is, is often over looked, that, in March, 1647, Cromwell had even proposed to leave England and take service in sermany under the Elector Palatine, a son of Frederick, ex-King of Bohemia, and Elizabeth daughter of James I. As this plan fell through, he was sent down in May with other commisers to attempt to effect a reconciliation between the army and the Parliament. In this he nearly succeeded; but, a few days after his return to Westminster, Parliament decided to disband the army at once without those concessions, which, n consequence of Cromwell's report, it had first seemed prepared to make. The soldiers, finding that only a small por ion of their arrears was to be paid, refused to disband, and, before the end of May, everything was in confusion.

The success of Cromwell's foreign policy is fully acknowledged. But he is represented as succumbing in the unending hopeless struggle with overwhelming difficulties at home. "Though his effor a to restore constitutional order had been s:upendous, and his political aims had been poble yet, in struggling to maintain order amidst chaos, he was attempting that which he at least could never do. Men will submit to the clearly axpressed will of the nation to which they belong, or to a government ruling in virtue of institutions which they and their ancestors have been in the habit of obeying, but they will not long submit to a successful soldier, even though, like Oliver, Mr. Gardiner considers Charles II. a man of

far greater ability than his father, and yet quite as ready as his father to use foreign help to get his way at home. It was funds, however, and money both from the Dutch and from the Span lards, in order to make himself independent of Parliament, but his character was very different from his father's, in so far as he always knew. what Charles I. never knew, how much he could to with impunity. "He is reported to have said that he was determined that whatever else happened, he would not go on his travels again, and he was perfectly aware that, if a single foreign regiment were brought by him to England be would soon find himself again a wanderer on the Continent. The people wished to be governed by the King, but also that the King should govern by the advice of Parliament. The Restoration was a restoration of Parliament, even more than a restoration of the King."

In the chapter on the struggle for American ndependence, Mr. Gardiner, speaking of the Continental Congress held in 1774, says: "There is reason to believe that those amongst the colonists who called themselves Loyalists, and would have clung to the connection with Great Britain in spite of all that was happening, formed at least a third of the population." John Adams, referring to a later period, expressed the belief that the Loyalists constituted one-half of the inhabitants of the colonies On page 784, we read that "17,-742 unhappy Germans were sent off like so many slaves to serve George III in reconquering Amerlica." The number of Germans who served under the British colors in America during the Revolutionary War was more than twice as large, On page 786, the population of the United States at the outbreak of the war for Independence is computed at "less than 2,000,000." The number is here underestimated by about a third. page 794, American success is explained in the following way: "American independence had been the work of an active minority, especially vigorous in New England and some other parts further south. This minority was always ready to take advantage of every circumstance arising in their favor, and to avail themselves of the assistance of the foreign enemies of England. The cause of America was, to some exteat, the cause of England herself. The same reason which made Parliament ready to set aside by an act of power the resistance of the Americans to the payment of a tax to which their representatives had not consented, had weighed with the House of Commons when they set aside the repeatedly declared choice of the Middlesex electors. In the one case, the British Parliament, in the other case the British House of Commons, insisted on having its way because it believed itself in the right. The principle of self-government or the system which acknowledges that it is better to allow a people to blunder in order that they may learn by experience than to operor them for their own good was at stake in both. It seemed as easy to suppress America as it was to suppress the Middlesex electors; and, when England discovered that this was not the case, she learnt a lesson which would teach her in the future how much consideration was due to those dependencies which were still left." If England did, in truth, learn such a lesson, no sign of it was visible in the attitude of her government toward her transmarine depend-encies for nearly two generations. More than fifty years elapsed after the independence of the Thirteen Colonies was acknowledged, before repre-ted to Canada.